

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Currently, claims 12-21 are pending in this application.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph:**

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-11 have been canceled. Applicant submits that claim 12 and new claims 13-21 are in full conformance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. For example, new claims 13-21 adopt the Office Action's helpful suggestion of reciting "dedicated task" and "shared task." Moreover, claim 12 deletes the recitation of "if" as suggested by the Office Action. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Office Action indicated that claim 12 would be allowable if the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is overcome. As discussed above, claim 12 is in full conformance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and thus claim 12 is allowable.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being

unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art (APA)<sup>1</sup> in view of Anderson et al (U.S. '735, hereinafter "Anderson"). Claims 1-11 have been canceled. Applicant submits that none of new claims 13-21 are "obvious" over APA in view of Anderson.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of APA and Anderson fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. For example, the combination fails to teach or suggest a plurality of tasks including a dedicated task and a shared task, the dedicated task causing a CPU to execute one specific event process corresponding to a specific event that includes a cyclic event which occurs in a cycle in synchronization with time, as required by independent claims 13, 16 and 20. Similarly, the combination fails to teach or suggest a dedicated task and a shared task, the dedicated task including a single specific event process corresponding to a specific event which occurs regularly at predetermined time intervals as required by independent claim 21.

The present invention therefore relates to two types of tasks: a dedicated task and a shared task. The dedicated task causes a CPU to execute (only) one

---

<sup>1</sup> The technical description provided in the "Background of the Invention" section of the application will be referred to hereinafter as "APA" (Applicant's admitted prior art) even though the technical description is labeled "Related Art" instead of "Prior Art." That is, Applicant will assume for the purposes of argument that the technical description provided in the "Related Art" is prior art. For the reasons described below, claims 13-21 are not "obvious" under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Anderson and the description provided in the "Background of the Invention" section of the application even if this description is assumed to be prior art.

specific event process corresponding to a specific event that includes a cyclic event occurring in a cycle in synchronization with time. The shared task causes the CPU to execute one of a plurality of non-specific event processes corresponding to a plurality of non-specific events (excluding the specific event noted above). Unlike the shared task, the dedicated task needs no queuing, and thus processing loads can be decreased. Exemplary embodiments of the present invention therefore enable the processing load on a CPU to be remarkably decreased since a specific event process corresponding to a cyclic event can be processed by a dedicated task.

Page 4 of the Office Action apparently alleges that the “DSP module” disclosed by Anderson corresponds to a specific event. Even assuming *arguendo* that this is true, the DSP request disclosed by Anderson is not a cyclic event which occurs in a cycle in synchronization with time as required by independent claims 13, 16 and 20. Similarly, the DSP request disclosed by Anderson does not teach a specific event which occurs regularly at predetermined time intervals.

Moreover, Anderson does not provide any teaching or suggestion of both a dedicated task and a shared task as further required by the claimed invention. As described above, a dedicated task is assigned only to a specific event which is cyclic (see claims 13, 16 and 20) or occurs regularly at predetermined time intervals (see claim 21), while a shared task is assigned to non-specific events.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 13-21 are not “obvious” in view of APA and Anderson.

**NISHIMURA**

**Application No. 10/020,437**

**May 10, 2005**

**Conclusion:**

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: 

Raymond Y. Mah  
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:sl

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4044

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100